

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on April 9, 2007. This is also in response to an Interview conducted with the Examiner on June 20, 2007. Claims 1-37 were pending in that action. All claims were rejected. With the present response, claims 1, 2 and 3-37 are amended. Claim 3 is canceled. New claims 40 and 41 are added. The addition of these two new claims is effectively a re-submission of the formally pending claims 38 and 39. Claims 38 and 39 were previously withdrawn in response to a restriction requirement. In light of the amendments presented with the present response, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims, including claims 40 and 41, comprise a single invention. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that a restriction requirement is no longer proper.

CONSIDERATION OF INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

SUBMITTED ON APRIL 3, 2007

Applicant submitted an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) on April 3, 2007. At this point, it would appear that the Examiner has not yet indicated consideration of that IDS. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the IDS and written confirmation thereof.

APPROVAL OF DRAWINGS REQUESTED

It is again pointed out that the Office Actions submitted up to this point have made no indication one way or the other as to whether Applicant's drawings have been accepted. Applicant respectfully requests confirmation that the drawings have been accepted.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

Beginning on page 7 of the latest Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-37 under 35 U.S.C. §101. In an interview conducted with the Examiner on June 20, 2007, Applicant was informed that the Examiner would withdraw the rejection under §101 if the claims were amended to reflect a computer readable "storage medium", and if the specification was

amended to exclude non-physical mediums such as carrier waves from the definition of “storage medium.” With the present response, Applicant has substantially conformed to these suggestions. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under §101 are respectfully solicited.

SUBSTANTIVE REJECTIONS

In the latest Office Action, claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0215626 (hereinafter referred to as “the Colossi reference”). Further, claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Colossi reference in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2005/0246370 (hereinafter referred to as “the Rubendall reference”). In the latest Office Action, claims 10-15 and 18-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Rubendall reference in view of the Colossi reference. Further, claims 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Rubendall reference in view of the Colossi reference and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,907,433 (hereinafter referred to as “the Wang reference”). In the latest Office Action, claims 27-32 and 35-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Rubendall reference in view of Colossi reference. In addition, claims 33 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Rubendall reference in view of the Colossi reference and further in view of the Wang reference.

During the interview of June 20, 2007, the Examiner indicated that the claims of the present invention could very well be in patentable form if amended to emphasize how the claimed data structures are utilized as a basis for automatically deriving a dimensional model that corresponds to an object-relational data model reflected in the data structures themselves. Specifically, Applicant and the Examiner discussed the fact that the cited Colossi reference fails to teach or suggest utilization of a standardized data structure for such a purpose.

In response, with the present amendments, Applicant has modified the claims such that they now recite a system that includes a processing engine that processes the claimed data structures and automatically derives, based on information in the data structures, a

dimensional model that corresponds to an object-relational data model reflected in the data structures themselves. Accordingly, for at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 2 and 3-37 are in patentable form. With the present response, claims 40 and 41 have been added. These claims also pertain to a system for generating a dimensional data model based on a model definition schema pre-processed by a driver. It is respectfully submitted that the cited reference fails to teach or suggest a method with such features.

IN CONCLUSION

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 2, 3-37, 40 and 41 are in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited. The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 
Christopher L. Holt, Reg. No. 45,844
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

CLH:slg